



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Germanische Sprachwissenschaft von Richard Loewe (Sammlung Götschen) Leipzig, Götschensche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1905. Pp. 148.

The author treats his subject in accordance with the well known habit of the Götschen series ; a large amount of information is forced into the smallest possible space. But unlike some of his predecessors, Loewe does, or tries to do, more than that : there is a breadth of view, an eye for underlying causes and principles, a tendency to give not a mere list of incoherent details, but a rational and synthetic presentation of a large subject in its manifold ramifications. One regrets all the more the limitations which the established character of the series inevitably imposed upon the writer ; yet, for a more thorough study we have Streitberg, and Bethge, Kluge, Noreen, and Brugmann, and since *Germanische Sprachforschung* had to have its turn in the Götschen collection, we are glad to note that the difficult subject has fallen to the share of a conscientious and clear-headed scholar. The wording of the rules is clear enough to be understood by readers who are somewhat familiar with the general aspects of language studies ; the book may, therefore, prove useful not only to students for a rapid review of the main data of Germanic grammar, but in a way it also places the subject within the reach of the educated and intelligent layman. We add a few remarks on details :

P. 12.—‘Die Veränderungen der Sprachen erstrecken sich theils auf die Lautform, theils auf die Bedeutung ihrer Wörter.’ But changes are going on constantly both in regard to form and meaning ; therefore read ‘einerseits—anderseits’ for ‘theils—theils.’

OHG. *magum* is in reality no more primitive than *mugum* ; some other illustration (e. g. *wurde* for *ward* after *wurden*) would be preferable.

The distinction between ‘spontaner’ and ‘combinatorischer’ Lautwandel is spurious ; there is no such thing as a spontaneous sound change anywhere.

P. 13.—German *s* has turned into *sch* not only before *l*, *m*, *n*, *w*, but also before *t*, *p*, *k* (the latter then disappearing), and the author might have improved the opportunity to say so, plainly, for the benefit of teachers and others who insist on considering the dialectal *s-tellen*, *s-prechen* as correct German forms.

‘Die Sprachveränderungen haben ihre wesentliche Ursache in ihrer Vererbung von Generation zu Generation.’ This is certainly true, and it is, I think, not generally enough recognized; but it is going too far, when in his next paragraph the author says: ‘Aus der Kindersprache stammen aber auch alle Analogiebildungen bei häufigen Wörtern.’

P. 14.—In regard to dissimilations it seems desirable to add, that they, after all, are mostly directed, if not caused, by some analogy, even though in individual cases we may not be able to tell with certainty the source of the influence.

Is the influence of the Babylonian sexagesimal system sufficient evidence to determine the question of the original home of the Aryans?

P. 15.—‘da sich gemeinsame Neuerungen natürlich nur über ein zusammenhängendes Gebiet ausdehnen können.’ This theory is applied repeatedly in the book, and conclusions drawn from it are stated as solid facts. But much is to be said against the theory and the actual conditions admit of other interpretations. The author himself once speaks of a sound change (*tt: ss*) as ‘so naheliegend, dass er griechisch unabhängig von den *satem* Sprachen stattgefunden haben kann,’ but on the whole he draws heavily on the wave theory to the exclusion of other motives; on p. 41 the *a*-Umlaut is supposed to have traveled across the sea.

P. 19.—It is not at all probable, but on the contrary it is practically impossible, that originally, or at any time, Germanic was spoken in Scandinavia and on the Danish islands only. This theory is not proved by any historical evidence, and it does not take into account the number and diversity of the Germanic tribes and the many early migrations of the same and of their neighbors, the Celts, Italics and Slavs.

P. 29.—The identity of the three persons plural in Old Saxon, and the *ō* of *gōs* and even the disappearance of *n* in *gōs*, *fīf* and *ūs*, etc., are ascribed directly to the influence of conquering Anglo-Frisians. Altogether, the author, like other philologists, seems inclined to overrate the historical and ethnological significance of linguistic phenomena.

P. 33.—*andawaurd* instead of *āndawaurd*, evidently a misprint.

P. 38.—Indoeuropean *ei* and *eu* do not coincide with *ai* and *au*. Cf. Gothic *keinan*, *lukan*, etc.

Since Indoeuropean *eu* remains *eu* in Germanic (urgermanisch), there is no good reason for putting down *iu* as the representative Old High German development (*kiusu*) any more than *eo* (*keosan*).

P. 39.—Gothic *aukan* 'sich mehren'; so also on p. 127 (*nehme zu*); it should be 'vermehren.'

P. 42.—There is an essential difference, well worth noticing, between the early Germanic *i*-Umlaut, Lat. *medius*, Old English *mid* (not *midd*, as the author has it), and the later *i*-Umlaut in the various Germanic dialects. The latter is a shifting towards the front (*a: e*, etc., mid back to mid front, etc.), while in the early Germanic change of *e* to *i* it is not the front but the *high* articulation of the following *i* (or *u*) which determines the direction of the change, the same high articulation which also causes the retention of Indoeuropean *i* and *u* (in **fiskiz*, *stigun*, **brūilaz*, *brūn*).

It would have been better to use the macron everywhere as the sign of vowel length; the author uses the acute accent in Old English and Icelandic; this, together with an occasional misprint, is apt to become somewhat confusing to the beginner. Thus in the paragraph on the *i*-Umlaut in Old English we are told that 'á (aus urg. ai oder ē) wird zu œ, ð zu é (sécan, got. sókjan), ú zu ý (ü),' etc. ! And by the way, Old English ð turns first to æ and thence to ē.

P. 44.—'Ahd. wird *au* vor *h* und allen Dentalen zu ð.' It should be 'vor germanischen *h*'; for the change does not take place before the OHG. *h* which has developed out of Germanic *k* (Goth. *auk*—OHG. *ouh*).

P. 46.—Under 'Quantitativer Ablaut' we read 'völlig ausgestossen wurden meist die kurzen Vokale *e*, *o*, *a*.' The 'meist' is quite wrong. *Only* short vowels disappear entirely; but they do not, in Germanic, disappear as a usual thing.

P. 47.—'Wenn in der zu kürzenden Silbe *r*, *l*, *m*, oder *n* vor oder hinter kurzem Vokal stand, so wurde die Liq. oder Nas. selbst silbisch.' It should be 'konnte—werden.' The *r*, etc., becomes syllabic before consonants, and it could become so before vowels.

'Die Adjective auf *-os* hatten idg. fast durchweg Endbetonung.' This is more particularly true of adjectives in *-nos* and *-tos*.

P. 51.—In Westgermanic as well as in Norse *p* became voiced after vowels.

P. 67.—The earlier Germanic disappearance of *i* consonant before *i* should have been mentioned by all means.

P. 111.—The numerals from 70 to 120 ‘sind unerklärt.’ Some of them are difficult indeed ; but it might safely be said, that *hund* and Gothic *tēhund* are nothing but varieties of the form used as ordinal in Gothic *taihund-a*, etc., ‘the tenth,’ ‘a decade,’ *hund* representing a shortened **dkmtóm*, and *tēhund* being derived from a lengthened **dēkm*; *tēhund* retained, like *taihunda*, its old meaning, thence *taihuntēhund*, like Old Norse *tio tiger* = ten decades = a ‘hundred,’ while the more isolated form *hund* developed also the specific meaning ‘the tenth number ten,’ = ten decades = a hundred, and in the combination *pusundi* = **tūs-kmtjē* = the ‘large hundred’ it even came to serve for a ‘thousand.’ In Old English, *hundseofontiz*, etc., the *-tiz* was added, when the meaning of *hund* had become obscured ; the *-ant* of Old Saxon *antsibunta* is a remnant of *hund*, developed as a pretonic syllable before voiceless *s*, while the ending *-ta*, OHG. *-zo* in *sibunzo* is a shortening of *-tah*, *-zuh*, the vowels as well as the *h* and *g* (tigus) alternating according to accent, and the *h*, of *-tah*, *-zoh* disappearing before vowels.

P. 113.—For ‘wenig’ (isolierte Reste) read ‘wenige.’

P. 127.—The elaborate attempt again to explain the preterit forms ON. *hét*, *lét*, *fekk*, etc., on the basis of original reduplication does not seem to me satisfactory ; since the author found it impossible to account for the Norse and Westgermanic vowels by *ablaut*, a frank statement that the question is not yet completely solved would have been in place in a work of this kind.

P. 143.—In the preterit participle of the strong verbs the *a*-Umlaut of *i* has, after all, had its way in Icelandic *beðenn*.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
EVANSTON, ILL.

Shakespeare and Voltaire. By Thomas R. Lounsbury. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

This book is part of a master-work on Shakespeare, the first volume of which—*Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*—appeared in 1901. According to Professor Lounsbury there existed, in the sixteenth as well as the nineteenth centuries, two forms of art, which may, for